ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. CONFIRMATION NO. APPLICATION NO. FILING DATE FIRST NAMED INVENTOR 10/615,569 07/07/2003 Steven A. Johnson 22027.CON 9030 04/19/2007 20551 **EXAMINER** THORPE NORTH & WESTERN, LLP. 8180 SOUTH 700 EAST, SUITE 200 JAWORSKI, FRANCIS J **SANDY, UT 84070** PAPER NUMBER ART UNIT 3768 SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE MAIL DATE **DELIVERY MODE** 3 MONTHS 04/19/2007 **PAPER**

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summan			
		10/615,569	JOHNSON ET AL.
	Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit
		Jaworski Francis J.	3768
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply			
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).			
Status			
1)⊠	Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12 Ja	anuary 2007.	
2a)⊠	This action is FINAL . 2b) This	s action is non-final.	
3)[Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is		
closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.			
Disposition of Claims			
 4) Claim(s) 1,3-7,9-27,29,30 and 36 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration. 5) Claim(s) 36 is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) 1,3-7,9-134,18-27 and 29 - 30 is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) 14-17 is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement. 			
Application Papers			
9)	The specification is objected to by the Examine	er.	
10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.			
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).			
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d). 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.			
Priority	under 35 U.S.C. § 119		
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 			
2) Noti	ce of References Cited (PTO-892) ce of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da	ate
	mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) er No(s)/Mail Date	5) Notice of Informal P 6) Other:	atent Application

Application/Control Number: 10/615,569

Art Unit: 3768

DETAILED ACTION

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 1, 3-7, 9-13, 18-27 and 29-30 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory double patenting over claims of copending Application No. 11/223,084, further in view of Johnson (US4222274)/Spivey/Clement, further in view of Brenden, all of the latter of record with the office action of 10/11/2006. This is a provisional double patenting rejection since the conflicting claims have not yet been patented.

The subject matter claimed in the instant application is fully disclosed in the referenced copending application and would be covered by any patent granted on that copending application since the referenced copending application and the instant application are claiming common subject matter, as follows: In Johnson '274 the

Application/Control Number: 10/615,569

Art Unit: 3768

ultrasound mammographic computer integrates data for example along curves 310, 312 in order to form a tomographic image for a water tank immersion system into which the breast assemblage has generally been held, as is the case with the remaining references and including breast immobilization features. Since the latter claims mammographic examination using a parabolic reconstruction algorithm (claim 6 for example), it would have been obvious to implement the claimed examination imaging method by using immersed breast appendage imaging techniques as were previously known. Furthermore, there is no apparent reason why applicant would be prevented from presenting claims corresponding to those of the instant application in the other copending application. See *In re Schneller*, 397 F.2d 350, 158 USPQ 210 (CCPA 1968). See also MPEP § 804. Accordingly this further application subsequently filed to

Allowable Subject Matter

this instant application is in double-patenting conflict therewith.

Claims 14 - 17 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Claim 36 is allowed.

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not

Application/Control Number: 10/615,569

Art Unit: 3768

Page 4

mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the

shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any

extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later

than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to Jaworski

Francis J. at telephone number 571-272-4738.

FJJ:fjj

04/12/2007

Francis J. Jaworski

Primary Examiner